STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW SUMMARY

School Food Authority Name: Cleveland County School District

Date of Administrative Review (Entrance Conference Date): January 30, 2017

Date review results were provided to the School Food Authority: March 9, 2017

General Program Participation

1.	What Child Nutrition Programs does the School Food Authority participate in? (Select all that apply)
	X School Breakfast Program
	X National School Lunch Program
	☐ Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program
	☐ Afterschool Snack
	☐ Seamless Summer Option
2.	Does the School Food Authority operate under any Special Provisions? (Select all that apply)
	□ Community Eligibility Provision
	☐ Special Provision 2
Review	Findings
3.	Were any findings identified during the review of this School Food Authority?
	$X Yes \square No$

If yes, please indicate the areas and what issues were identified in the table below.

YES	NO		iic area	REVIEW FINDINGS
X		A. Program Access and Reimbursement		
		YES	NO	
		X		Certification and Benefit Issuance
		X		Verification
		X		Meal Counting and Claiming
		Findin	g(s) De	
		1)		ce documents of free and reduced price eligibility status were
				wed for 295 eligible students. This source document review included
				ee and reduced price meal applications. There were 18 errors on the
		2)		viewed applications.
		2)		w direct certification match was available on January 18 th , however at
				me of the review this list had not been downloaded by the mining official.
		3)		r categorically eligible lists (migrant, homeless, foster children, Head
		3)		Even Start) must be signed and dated by the appropriate liaison. The
				were pulled from eSchool enrollment records; however, these
				orially eligible lists must to be signed and dated by the appropriate
			liaiso	ons (homeless liaison, foster liaison, etc.).
		4)		ne Free and Reduced Price Meal Application distributed to the
				eholds, Question #5 told households they could apply for meal
				fits online by going through the United States Department of
			_	culture (USDA) website. There is not a method for households to
				online through USDA.
		5)		d on a review of applications chosen to be verified, it was determined
				he applications chosen did not all meet the "error prone" designation
			as rec	quired for Standard Sample verification method.

	1				
		6)		pplications pulled to be verified must be confirmed to have been	
		accurately determined prior to letters being sent to households. The			
			confi	rmation reviews did not take place until after the verification process	
			was c	completed.	
		7)	Docu	mentation of contact with households regarding verification activities	
			were	not retained by the district and therefore not available for review.	
			This	includes initial letters sent to households announcing the application	
			was c	chosen for verification, second contact attempt information for	
				eholds that failed to respond, letters of benefit status after verification	
				completed, etc.	
		8)		(5) applications were chosen to be verified and only one (1)	
		- /		chold responded by returning payroll documentation. Students on the	
				applications should have had their free or reduced price benefits	
				ged to paid meal benefits based on non-response to verification by no	
				than November 15, 2016. At the time of the review, the students on	
				four non-response applications were still receiving free and reduced	
				benefits and had never been changed back to paid status.	
		9)		Verification Tracker Form was not completed for each application	
		//		en for verification.	
		10		and reduced price meals were not being counted accurately by	
		10		ory at the point of service at Rison Elementary at the time of the	
				w. The district is not performing counting and claiming in the	
				her indicated on the Meal Count and Collections Procedures approved	
				rt of the 2016-17 Agreement and Policy Statement	
	П	R M		terns and Nutritional Quality	
X		YES	NO	verils and realization Quality	
		X		Meal Components and Quantities	
		X		Offer versus Serve	
		X	П	Dietary Specifications and Nutrient Analysis	
			g(s) Det		
				rvation at the time of the review confirmed that students at Rison	
		1)		School were not taking all of the required meal components,	
				fore, were not meeting meal pattern requirements that would allow	
				meals to be claimed for reimbursement as part of the federal child	
				<u> </u>	
		2)		tion programs.	
		2)		e of the menus planned did not have all of the required meal pattern	
		2)		conents to meet for the grade groups being offered.	
		3)		versus Serve signage for Breakfast and Lunch was not present at the	
		4)		of the review.	
		4)		child nutrition staff were not requiring students that did not take fruit getable to take the required component or to charge the student the	
				dult price for the meal (the meal is not reimbursable so adult meal	
		<i>5</i> \		s would need to be collected for the meals).	
		5)		d on observation at time of review the serving staff did not have a	
				understanding of the appropriate planned size of servings or required	
			servii	ng sizes for each grade group.	
		6)	Based	d on observation, it does not appear all of the recipes provided for	
		6)	Based revie	w purposes were actually being used by child nutrition staff, making	
37		,	Based revied it imp	w purposes were actually being used by child nutrition staff, making possible to determine meal pattern compliance.	
X		C. So	Based revied it imperchool N	w purposes were actually being used by child nutrition staff, making	
X		C. So	Based revie it imp chool No	w purposes were actually being used by child nutrition staff, making possible to determine meal pattern compliance. utrition Environment	
X		C. So YES	Based revier it imperbool No	w purposes were actually being used by child nutrition staff, making possible to determine meal pattern compliance. utrition Environment SFA On-Site Monitoring	
X		C. So	Based revie it imperhool No	w purposes were actually being used by child nutrition staff, making possible to determine meal pattern compliance. utrition Environment SFA On-Site Monitoring Local School Wellness Policy	
X		C. So YES	Based revier it imperbool No	w purposes were actually being used by child nutrition staff, making possible to determine meal pattern compliance. utrition Environment SFA On-Site Monitoring	

	X	Smart Snacks in Schools
	X	Professional Standards
	X	Water
X		Food Safety
X		Storage
X		Buy American
X		Reporting and Record Keeping
	X	School Breakfast Program and Summer Meals Outreach
	X	Other

Finding(s) Details:

- SFA On-Site Monitoring was not completed for the 2015-16 or the 2016-17 school year.
- 2) Documentation of when and how reviews/updates to the Local Wellness Policy occur was not available at the time of the review.
- 3) Documentation of how potential stakeholders are made aware of their ability to participate in all Local Wellness Policy activities. No documentation was available at the time of the review.
- 4) Documentation details of the most recent assessment of Local Wellness Policy implementation and public notification. No documentation was available at the time of the review.
- 5) Copy of the current and updated Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HACCP) Food Safety Plan was available in Ms. Beard's office but was not being used by the child nutrition staff.
- 6) Non-compliance issues noted in the two most recent health inspections had not been corrected at the time of the review.
- 7) Temperature logs for all freezers and refrigerators are available; however, temperature logs were not available for the dry storage area.
- 8) Time and Temperature Monitoring Records of prepared foods were not available when requested.
- 9) Thermometer temperature checks/calibration records were not available for review.
- 10) Food items are not date marked in the storage areas, as required. Food items must be date marked when delivered to the cafeteria to ensure proper "First In-First Out" (FIFO) inventory control. In addition, food items that are left over and stored in the freezer and cooler were not date marked or labeled to indicate the food item, the date prepared, and the date stored as required.
- 11) The dry storage, freezer and coolers were disorganized and over-crowded making it impossible to know what exactly is available for use. This disorganized food storage also makes it difficult to control inventory. The overcrowded and disorganized storage areas were cited in the November 2016 Health Inspection Report.
- 12) Buy American documentation was not available at the time of the review. Numerous food items were found in the dry storage, freezer and cooler that did not meet the Buy American requirements for the child nutrition program.
- 13) By observation there were a lot of dented cans in the dry storage area. Documentation from both the previous monitoring review as well as health inspection report in 2014 indicates dented cans were cited as a violation.
- 14) Financial information on Claim for Reimbursement does not match the Arkansas Public School Network (APSCN) financial reports for child nutrition expenditures.
- 15) The Renewal Agreement and Policy Statement between the district and ADE CNU for the 2016-17 school year has several areas that are not accurate and need to be updated.

X		D. Civil Rights			
		Finding(s) Details:			
		Documentation of the USDA non-discrimination statement was not on the			
		district web site.			
	X	E. Other			
		Finding(s) Details:			